# MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON ULSTER.

---

"IRISH members have said that they would rather have no Bill at all than a Bill which did not place Ulster under the power of the dominant majority at Dublin, and which did not give the Dublin Parliament power to tax Ulster. I can quite understand that. I can quite understand that a Dublin Parliament without the power to tax Ulster might find itself in financial difficulties. **But the question is whether it is fair to Ulster.** I am not going to say anything about the armed resistance which has been threatened in Ulster. I know nothing about it. We have heard that these threats have been made before, and that they have not been followed by anything dangerous, and very likely it will be the same thing again. The other day the hon. member for Cork actually got up in the House and accused me of incitement to assassination and outrage. No charge could possibly be more absurd or ridiculous. I have not said a word, either in speech or writing, about physical violence in connection with this measure. I only notice the statement of the hon. member for Cork to express the satisfaction with which I find him denouncing even the most shadowy and imaginary incitements to violence and outrage. Well, Sir, what I want to ask the House is this: If the resistance of Ulster is expressed in the usual constitutional way, or if resistance of a portion—and an important portion—of Ulster is expressed in the same way to any proposal for submitting them to a Dublin Parliament, will you override it, will you ignore it? I say you ought not. Now, I listened the other night to the speech of my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Stansfeld), and really there have been so many good speeches made from the Treasury Bench in this debate that I do not know to which to give the palm; I admired his speech very much, although there was one passage in it, the interpretation placed on which I think he should regret. I will read the exact words of my right hon. friend. He said:—

"'I regard it as about the most weighty and condemnatory testimony that could be borne that our former rule of Ireland has led now, at this moment, to the existence of a portion of the Irish people so divided from the rest, so hostile, so unsympathetic, so unbelieving, that no spark of Irish patriotism, as it would appear, is kindled in their breasts by the prospect of being permitted, under this system of autonomy, to contribute thus directly to the prosperity of their country.'

"Sir, why are the Protestants of Ulster stigmatised by my right hon. friend as unpatriotic and unsympathetic? Why, **because they are proud to belong to a greater country; because they take their share in the autonomy of the United Kingdom in which they have a part; because they cling to the traditions and the history of the United Kingdom, which is just as much their possession and heritage as it is ours; because they refuse to be cast adrift and cut away from the hopes and associations which they have hitherto cherished.** I suppose if my right hon. friend had been a Frenchman he would have denounced the people of Alsace and Lorraine as unsympathetic and unpatriotic, when they refused to be reunited to Germany and when their hearts turned towards the great country from which they were forcibly separated. I suppose if he had been an Italian he would have denounced those members of the Savoyard community who did their utmost to prevent the transfer of their country to France; and loyalty must indeed be at a discount when a passionate allegiance to the unity of the kingdom is made a moral offence and crime by a Minister of the Crown. . . . . **Now, is it a fact that the Ulster Protestants do fear for their material and their religious interests?** There is no doubt whatever about it in the mind of any man who reads the papers or or attends public meetings or knows anything at all about the state and condition of Protestant Ulster. But was I right to say they had some reason for it? Well, I belong to an extreme section of the Liberal party, who have all my political life joined with those who would destroy every shred of religious ascendency, by whatever sect it may be claimed. But then I think that gives me and those who think with me the right to protest against the substitution of one form of religious ascendency for another, and I say that the Catholic Church by its tenets and by its faith is bound not to be content with equality, but to demand predominance. Hon. members from Ireland think not. I will give them an authority for it. Here is a pamphlet written by the Prime Minister in 1875 on Vaticanism. The Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone) said then:—'It is true—it is absolutely true—that to secure rights has been, and is, the aim of Christian civilisation; to destroy them and to establish the resistless, domineering action of a purely central power is the aim of the Roman policy.'"—HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Times*, June 2, 1886.

PUBLISHED FOR THE LIBERAL UNIONIST COMMITTEE, price 5s. per 1,000, by CASSELL AND COMPANY, LIMITED, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.]

*Printed by W. Speaight & Sons, Fetter Lane, London.*